

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, and 15, which are independent, are amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at paragraphs [0065] and [0110].

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. SUPPORT FOR THIS AMENDMENT

Citations to Figures and Specification locations are provided. However, such citations are provided merely as examples and are not intended to limit the interpretation of the claims or to evidence or create any estoppel.

As an example, support of the amendment can be found at paragraphs [0065] and [0110], which is reproduced as follows:

[0065] Into the slot 104c, a digital reality creation (DRC) circuit substrate 124 (hereinafter referred to as "DRC circuit 124" simply) for performing image quality improvement processing as

functional block 4 is inserted. Into the slot 104d, a substrate 125 (hereinafter referred to as "panel-dedicated processing circuit 125" simply) of a panel-dedicated processing circuit such as a liquid crystal display (LCD) or a plasma display panel (PDP) as functional block 5 is inserted. Into the slot 104e, a noise removal circuit substrate 127 (hereinafter referred to as "noise removal circuit 127" simply) as functional block 7 is inserted.

[0110] The common commands DRCvol(resolutionVal,noiseVal) are delivered from the system control block 110 to the control bus 111 when the user operates the remote-control transmitter 112 or the operation section 113 in the chassis 101 to change volume values of the resolution axis and the noise axis. It is to be noted that "resolutionval" indicates a volume value of the resolution axis and "noiseval" indicates a volume value of the noise axis.

III. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Office Action (see page 2) stated that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 22, 2006 by Applicants failed to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(3) because it did not include a concise explanation of the relevance. The Office Action stated that documents 20045053, 2003196230, 20011511558, and a non-patent literature entitled "Multi-Master Hoshiki no Shani Network Protocol CAN no Kiso Chishiki" that were listed in the Information Disclosure Statement were placed in the application file and were not considered.

Applicants submit that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 22, 2006 fully complies with 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(3). The requirement of a concise explanation of relevance, according to MPEP 604.09(a)(III), "where the information listed is not in the English

language, but was cited in a search report or other action by a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application, the requirement for a concise explanation of relevance can be satisfied by submitting an English-language version of the search report or action which indicates the degree of relevance found by the foreign office,” is satisfied by the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 22, 2006. A copy of English translation of a Search Report that cited the above-identified documents was submitted on September 22, 2006 along with other documents in the Information Disclosure Statement. The image wrapper file associated with this application and entitled “WIPO Publication - Non-English version” in USPTO database includes the Search Report.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office considers documents 20045053, 2003196230, 20011511558, and a non-patent literature entitled “Multi-Master Hoshiki no Shani Network Protocol CAN no Kiso Chishiki” that are included in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on September 22, 2006.

IV. OBJECTIONS

The title of this application was objected to.

The title of this application is amended in this paper, thereby obviating the objections.

V. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AND §103(a)

Claims 1-8 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,614,804 to McFadden et al. (hereinafter, merely “McFadden”).

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,754,719 to Nakatsugawa et al. (hereinafter, merely “Nakatsugawa”).

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over McFadden and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,345,185 to Yoon et al. (hereinafter, merely “Yoon”).

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over McFadden and further in view of Nakatsugawa.

Claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over McFadden and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,432 to Hao et al. (hereinafter, merely “Hao”).

IV. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

wherein the information signal includes image signals, and at least one functional block of the plural function blocks performs an image quality improvement processing, and the common command includes information related to the image quality improvement processing. (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that McFadden, Nakatsugawa, Yoon, and Hao, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or render predictable the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, nothing is found that teaches or discloses or renders predictable **“wherein the information signal includes image signals, and at least one functional block of the plural function blocks performs an image quality improvement processing, and the common command includes information related to the image quality improvement processing,”** as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 14 and 15, which recite similar limitations with claim 1, are also patentable for similar reasons.

As nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action cures the above-identified deficiencies, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. As nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action cures the above-identified deficiencies, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections. As each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


Because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800